DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 064 451 UD 012 802

AUTHOR Harrington, Charles
TITLE Pupils, Peers and Politics.
PUB DATE 6 Apr 72
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the joint meeting of the American Ethnological Society, the Society for Applied Anthropology, and the Council on Anthropology and Education, Montreal, April 6, 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Authoritarianism; Classroom Environment; Field Studies; Ghettos; *Literature Reviews; Negro Youth; Parent Attitudes; *Peer Relationship; *Political Socialization; School Organization; Spanish Speaking; Student Attitudes; *Student Behavior; Student School Relationship; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS New York City

ABSIRACT

Analyzing the scope and methods of the literature on political socialization reviewed in sources published heretofore, this study lists the major omissions in the existing literature as (1) neglecting the influence of peers, (2) neglecting informal processes within schools, (3) being limited to certain methodologies to the exclusion of others, and (4) neglecting anything but white, mainstream Americans as subjects. As a result of the latter, the research reported in the study was done in a multi-ethnic working class ghetto-like neighborhood in New York City, about 45 percent black, 45 percent Spanish-speaking, and 10 percent white. Methodology encompassed participant observation with considerable time spent in the schools themselves, interviews with staff, parents, and children, examination of peer effects in playground settings, and a full teaching schedule totalling about 26 full time equivalent months spent in the variety of field settings examined. Findings include aspects of authoritarianism in the schools, the undemocratic nature of schools, and the conflict between the symbols, ideals, and myths of the school and the political reality of the child's life. [Parts of this document are not clearly legible due to the print quality of the original.] (Author/RJ)

ED 064451

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Pupils, Peers and Politics*

Charles Harrington

June 1, 1972

*This is a revision and expansion of the paper Ritual, Political Socialization and Schools: An Analysis of Some New York City Schools delivered at the November, 1971 meetings of the American Anthropological Association. The present version was prepared at the invitation of the "Learning and Culture" symposium at the American Ethnological Society's joint meeting with the Society for Applied Anthropology and the Council on Anthropology and Education, April 6, 1972 in Montreal, Canada and will be published in the proceedings of that symposium. I would like to express my gratitude to my colleagues in the anthropology and education program at Teachers College-Columbia University, especially William Dalton, Carol Lopate, Ernest Marraccini, and Frances Schwartz, for their careful criticism of the manuscript. In addition, Mary Williams, Joan Vincent and Peter Gumpert offered comments which improved the final product. Thanks go to Norman Adler for his assistance with the textbook study, and to the New York State Commission on the Quality, Cost and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education in New York State for supporting it. The other studies reported here were supported entirely by the Center for Urban Studies and Programs of Teachers College-Columbia University, Lambros Comitas, Director.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UD 012802

An individual's ability to survive in a political system is based upon his mastery of the tools and knowledge that will enable him to successfully reap premiums from a less than bountiful crop. Premiums are anything in short supply in a society. They may take the form of material goods, power, status, or safety. Since there are no societies in which all of these are in an unlimited supply, there is always the problem of distribution: Who gets what and who doesn't? Political decisions that affect an individual are made both in and out of formal government processes. While government and its processes are a part of political learning they are not its entirety. An individual must be aware of the variety of modes and channels of supply and demand, or constantly risk missing the opportunity to get more of what there is and/or losing that which he already has. Whether men succeed or fail in this quest for premiums the activities are the product of their socialization. This is not to say that socialization centered explanations can account for all of politics. Certainly some premiums are not available to whole classes of people because of social structural variables, e.g. caste or class systems. Students of socialization cannot account for the occurrence of such systems, but they can help account for how such systems are maintained. This point is made explicitly by Harrington and Whiting (1972:469) who argue it is their purpose to explain not only how the content of social role is learned but also how a "society induces its members willingly to accept" such role responsibilities. Students of political socialization can also analyze within culture variation in meeting such requirements. That is,

by focusing attention on learning and personality dimensions students of political socialization can help us understand (i.e. predict certain characteristics of) who accepts his lot and who rebels against it. For example Gurr (1970) not only specifies the social conditions which lead to rebellion but within that framework examines personality studies which help account why within those structural conditions certain men do and others do not rebel.

As an anthropologist I am concerned that my conceptualization of politics be cross culturally useful. Defining politics as decision-making about the distribution of scarce resources leads me to focus more on political process than the content of a particular political system thereby facilitating cross cultural comparisons. Therefore in this paper the focus is on the learning of skills for participating in political process broadly conceived. This is a different emphasis from that of the existing political socialization literature. Largely a product of the fields of political science and psychology, it is largely limited to western style political systems and how knowledge about government institutions is transmitted to future generations.[1] This gives rise to studies about the age at which one recognizes ones' flag (Lawson 1963), attitudes toward the President (e.g., Sigel 1965), congress (Hess & Torney 1967), etc. Further as Easton (1968) and Sigel (1968) have recently suggested the literature is largely concerned with the learning of knowledge and attitudes which support the existence of these familiar regimes ignoring behavior (like rioting) which does not. (For reviews of the present literature on the study of political socialization see Adler and Harrington

---

[1] Work directly related to political socialization in non-Western political systems is largely limited to some speculations by Levine (1960, 1963); but see Wilson 1970.

1970; Sigel 1971; Greenberg 1970; and Harrington n.d.).

The scope and methods of the literature on political socialization reviewed in these sources is more limited than those of this paper. Indeed there are four major omissions to which our research with its broader scope is directed. This list of omissions is not meant to be exhaustive but reflects the specific limitations which a definition of politics broader than formal government is designed to correct. Specifically, the existing literature 1) neglects the influences of peers, 2) neglects informal processes within schools 3) is limited to certain methodologies to the exclusion of others and 4) neglects anything but white, mainstream Americans as subjects.

1. Peers

The compilation and analysis of empirical research made by Adler and Harrington (1970), of the present literature on political socialization shows that it examines essentially three inputs to the child; family, school and peers. Until now, however, there have been relatively few studies of peer influences. The two major books in the last ten years (Hess and Torney, 1967; and Easton and Dennis, 1969) focus almost entirely on family and school effects. Hess and Torney (1967) present an analysis of the data gathered in 1962 in a national survey of over 12,000 white elementary school children (grades 2-8) in eight large and medium-sized American cities. Hess and Torney attempt to relate these data to four political socialization "models," or general patterns describing the processes through which political attitudes are developed: accumulation, interpersonal transfer, identification, and cognitive-developmental. Several types of political attitudes are studied: attachment to the

nation, relationship to institutions and authority figures representing government, compliance with authority and law, attitudes toward processes of influence on public policy, and orientations towards elections and political parties. This is an example of the narrow conceptualization of politics referred to earlier. The analysis deals with the content of these attitudes, their developmental patterns, and the agents of their socialization. Relationships between the political variables and individual characteristics--social class, intelligence, sex, and party affiliation--are also studied. The following are a few of the major findings. The acquisition of the kind of political attitudes studied proceeds rapidly during the elementary school years, especially from the second to the fifth grade; the greatest change occurs between the ages nine and ten. By the eighth grade children's "political" orientations are quite similar to those of their teachers in many ways. The first political orientation to be developed is a strong positive attachment to the nation. The child's initial relationship with government (formally defined) centers on the President, and his view of government institutions at all levels is highly personalized. His attitudes toward political authority figures and government institutions are highly positive, becoming somewhat less so as he matures. He also becomes increasingly able to distinguish the incumbent from the office, and to deal with concepts of impersonal institutions. Children also have a high regard for law, law enforcement agencies, and citizen obedience. Voting is emphasized as a citizen obligation. Children begin to engage in political activities such as wearing campaign buttons at an early age, and these activities increase steadily with age. The sense of political efficacy (very narrowly defined) also increases with age.

While children tend to see the individual as a powerful force in the political process, they apparently have little knowledge of the role of pressure groups (one kind of knowledge about political process).

Hess and Torney found that the school is the most important agent of political socialization in the United States. Family influence is seen as limited largely to generalized attitudes toward authority, and partisan attachments. The school reinforces the child's emotional attachment to his nation, and teaches him norms of citizen obedience and conformity. Although the school stresses the obligation to vote, it tends to de-emphasize other forms of citizen participation. It pays little attention to political parties, pressure groups, and political conflict. In this study the individual characteristics that apparently had the most influence on the learning of the particular political attitudes and behavior measured were sex, social class, and "intelligence." Children with IQ's (note that it is not only politics which is narrowly defined!) acquired their political attitudes at a faster rate than those with lower IQ's and tended to see the political system in more realistic terms, and had a greater sense of political efficacy. Social status appeared to be somewhat less important than IQ, but it was also related to feelings of efficacy and to types of participation and interests. (See Easton and Dennis 1969 for a second report on the Chicago Project). We cannot conclude this summary of Hess and Torney without emphasizing that their definition of politics makes it difficult to use their findings to help construct a theory of political socialization within the framework I have laid out here with its more general concerns. While we will make use of some of their findings e.g. that the ages 9-11 are important ones it is possible that these years may be crucial ones in learning what Hess

and Torney call politics but not in the learning of political process as we have defined it. Care must be taken in using any findings based upon one definition of politics for research of a different scope.

Kenneth Langton is virtually alone in emphasizing the importance of peers as an independent variable. Langton in 1967 studied the influence of the informal school environment--the social class "climate" of the peer group and the school on lower class students political attitudes. The results suggest that learning in peer groups may be more significant than formal civic education for political socialization. Specifically, his study of secondary school students in Jamaica, West Indies, showed that the working class students had less positive attitudes to ard voting and are less politically cynical and less economically conservative than middle class or upper class students. Lower class students whose classmates are also from the lower class are likely to have political attitudes characteristic of the lower class. But lower class students in heterogeneous class peer groups--those which include higher class students--are likely to support higher class norms. Thus, the peer group class environment and the social class climate of the school apparently have a cumulative affect on students' attitudes. Interaction with higher class peers functions to socialize lower class students toward the political orientation of the higher classes. What good it will do them in an educational system described by Comitas (1971) as one designed to prevent movement out of the lower class is unclear.

The possibilities of the contribution of interaction with peers to the learning of political skills and attitudes has not yet been pursued adequately by the political socialization literature, however. After all, even Langton only studies one easy measure, social class of peers, and

does not directly examine peer interaction or process, and limits politics to attitude variables about a particular system. With our own emphasis on the learning of skills for participation in politics this is doubly unfortunate. The anthropological literature does indirectly offer some data to complement the political socialization literature. For example, Mayer and Mayer (1970) describe socialization by peers in the youth organization of the Red Xhosa. They describe a system through which children advance in stages, each of which enlarges their mobility and number of contacts and each of which successively places more constraints upon them. Younger children are members of largely local groups in which aggress on and sex-play is tolerated if not encouraged. As the child moves through the system he learns rules which increasingly control his aggressiveness and inculcate a respect for 'law' until, at circumcision he becomes an adult. In adulthood disputes are settled by law (argument) not by sticks (fighting). What is interesting here about the Xhosa is that the youth organization is free of adult control, yet the peer run socialization devices lead to successful entrance into the role of Xhosa adult. Perhaps one of the reasons the political socialization literature has ignored peers is an assumption following Parsons that peer groups are characterized by

> "compulsive independence in relation to certain adult expectations, . . . which in certain cases is expressed in overt defiance. . . or a certain recalcitrance to pressure of adult expectations and discipline." (Parsons 1949:221)

Since the political socialization literature is largely concerned with system support learning, such an assumption would not lead to studies of peer effects.

However, whether peer groups are rebellious, insulated or integrated with or from adult culture, they offer their members opportunity to practice and perfect political skills. For example, among the Xhosa

> "(the peer group) is a junior forum whose members, in a kind of earliest play, practice the political skills they will need in the real forum later on. (Mayer and Mayer 1970:174).

This kind of peer group learning fits in well with a cognitive developmental view of learning as recently developed by Kohlberg (1969).

> "The second group in which the child participates is the peer group. While psychoanalysts have taken the family (the first group) as a critical and unique source of moral role taking (e.g. identification), Piaget (1948) has viewed the peer group as a unique source of role-taking opportunities for the child. According to Piaget, the child's unilateral respect for his parents, and his egocentric confusion of his own perspective with that of his parents, prevents him from engaging in the role-taking based on mutual respect necessary for moral development. While the empirical findings support the notion that peer-group participation is correlated with moral development, it does n t suggest that such

> participation plays a critical or unique role for moral development. . . . While peer group participation appears to be stimulating of moral development, its influence seems better conceptualized in terms of providing general role taking opportunities. . ."

Kohlberg is then arguing that peer groups provide an opportunity to practice the behaviors that the culture (or elders) prescribe as desirable. This perspective also provides a hint for some of the dynamics in which each child by trial and error acquires behavioral expectations (making organization of diversity possible, see Wallace 1971). Peer groups also provide an opportunity for what Pettit (1946) argued is a most potent kind of learning: directed practice. For a variety of theoretical and empirical reasons then, I feel that the influence of peers on the learning of political skills has been slighted. Note too, that in terms of the learning theories outlined by Hess and Torney earlier, that identification models useful for studying Family effects are not expected to be as useful for peers as cognitive-developmental, interactional and accumulation type learning theories.

Most of the existing anthropological literature on peer group socialization in the U.S. concerns adolescence or young adulthood (Miller 1958, 1964, Whyte 1955, Liebow 1965, Hannerz 1969). However, in examining peer group learning it is important to keep in mind the studies in developmental psychology recently reviewed by Hartup (1970:411) which show middle childhood to be the period of "greatest responsiveness to normative influence of peers." We focus here therefore on the period 9-11 years as the

period in which maximal "political" learning is said to occur (by students of political socialization). Since it overlaps the ages which the general developmental psychology literature spotlights for maximal peer effect on learning the absence of studies of peer effects is all the more startling and the need for study obvious.

2. Pupils

Generally when the political socialization literature examines schools, it only examines part of what actually goes on in them. To Langton and Jennings 1968, school means curriculum. Their study dealt with the question of the effect of high school courses in "American government," "problems of democracy," "comparative politics," "international relations," and the like, on student's political knowledge, "politicization" (interest, discussion, and medial usage), "civic tolerance" (acceptance of diversity), and feelings of political efficacy, cynicism, and participative orientations. Interview data were obtained from a national probability sample of 1,669 high school seniors attending 97 public and non-public American schools, and from their parents. In a multivariate analysis of the effect of civics curriculum, seven variables were held constant: quality of the school, grade average, sex, student's political interest, number of history courses taken, parental education, and discussion of politics within the family. Findings for the entire sample showed that the civics curriculum had little effect on student's knowledge, beliefs, attitudes or feelings toward government.

To Edgar Litt, school means textbooks. Litt reports on a comparative study of civic education in three American communities with differing socio-economic characteristics and differing levels of political activity. All

of the communities were in the Boston metropolitan area. In the upper-middle class community there was a great deal of political activity, in the lower-middle class community a moderate amount of such activity, and in the working class community little political participation. The data consisted of a content analysis of civic education texts used in the three communities during a five-year period, interviews with community leaders and educational administrators on their views of the communitiy's civic education program, and questionnaires administered to civic education classes (and control groups) in the major high school in each community. The results showed that the textbooks of the two middle-class communities emphasized citizen participation to a greater degree than those used in the working-class community. Only in the upper-middle class community was there an attempt to transmit a view of politics as a political process involving political action and the use of power as a means for resolving group conflict. The author concludes that the content of civic education and the type of political role that students were being trained to play varied according to the social class of the students.

In contrast, focusing on teachers, Hess and Torney find for their measures of political knowledge the school, "the most effective instrument of political socialization in the United States." (see above) But, they can't tell us how or why the school has its effect. Adler and Harrington (1970) argued that what was needed was studies that will focus not on the formal aspects of schooling, but on the informal processes within the schools which will help us understand what the schools accomplish and how. These first two problems obviously are related in that as we focus on the informal processes in schools we will be paying more attention to the peer group relations within the schools themselves.

3. Method

These two omissions are related to a third limitation of the political socialization literature which is its limitation to certain methodologies. The conceptual neatness that separates school, family, and peers in the non-anthropological studies referred to above results in part from their reliance on questionnaire-type methodologies, in which these variables are necessarily neatly distinct.

Methodology interacts with theory by leading us to see the world in a particular way and blinding us to others. In focusing on informal interaction, process and peer effects we will use an observational methodology. A study of a classroom with 30 students and one teacher should be more sensitive to Gestalt and more likely to reveal process than pencil and paper questionnaires about child's knowledge of content variable and measures of his attitudes. Anthropology obviously contains methodologies (like participant and systematic observation) uniquely adapted to such a study. We discuss this further below. In addition, the validity of data generated from say second or third graders by paper and pencil techniques is, I feel, subject to severe question. Can we really put much faith in responses to such techniques for this age? Why has the field as a whole opted for large numbers for statistical analysis before doing in depth studies which might reveal better questions?

4. Subjects

We come now to the problem of whom to use as subjects. Since the political socialization literature consists almost wholely of studies of white mainstream Americans it can be fairly criticized by asking how much of what is seen is limited just to that group? Jaros, Hirsch and

Fleron's 1968 study of the political orientations of children living in the impoverished Appalachian region of Kentucky suggest the answer 'a lot'. They focus on children's image of the President, political cynicism, and perceptions of parents' political efficacy. Questionnaire data were gathered in 1967 from almost all the children attending grades five through twelve in one Kentucky county, and 305 of these children were selected at random for the present study. Hess and Easton's (1960) questions were used to measure attitudes toward the President; Jennings and Niemi's (1968) "political cynicism scale' was used as the measure of cynicism; and two items from the Easton and Dennis study (1967) of political efficacy were used as rough measures of parental attitudes toward government (these questions were asked of the children, not the parents). In comparing their results with the findings of previous research on more middle-class, urban samples of children, the authors found that the Kentucky children had markedly less positive views of the President (than children questioned prior to 1964: note the change in President) and expressed more cynical attitudes toward politics in general. There was little change in these basic orientations with increasing age. Moderate relationships were found between the child's perception of his family's political efficacy and some of the items used to measure the child's political affect. The findings also indicated that there was little relationship between the child's view of political authorities and his image of his father; there was a positive relationship between the father's absence from the home and the child's tendency to have a positive attitude toward the President. The authors conclude that findings of the child's views of political authority are probably sub-culture-bound.

We have therefore chosen not to focus our observations at first on the white middle class group, but in order to help redress the balance of the literature, to focus on a multi-ethnic working class ghetto-like area of New York City. (We focus here not only on theoretical but also on moral grounds: these students are coming from environments in which their parents have not successfully been able to compete for premiums: we want to know what if anything, the schools are doing or might do to redress that and provide these children with the tools necessary to political efficacy. If our answer is very little and much harm besides, which work of Litt 1966, Adler and Harrington 1970, and Levy 1970, suggest at least we will know more about processes which could be changed and would then be in a position to suggest some alternatives.) There are some studies of black political socialization. However they are simply repetitions of methods referred to above coupled with anthropologically naive comparisons of "black and white" children neither of which labels is even defined for the reader (see Greenberg 1970, Lyons 1970, Engstrom 1970).

SETTING AND METHOD

The research reported here was done in a neighborhood of New York City. Ethnically the neighborhood is about 45% Black, 45% Spanish speaking (made up of approximately equal numbers of Puerto Ricans and Dominicans, with lesser numbers of Cubans: The Dominicans are the most recent arrivals) and 10% white. The neighborhood is striated into ethnic enclaves, Blacks being in the east, spanish speaking centered, and the middle class white community segregated to the west. The poulations in the various schools served in this neighborhood are variations on the above figures. The whites tend to be even more underrepresented because the children often go to private schools.

This area is a meeting point of two transitions. First, it was formerly a Jewish and Irish area which has undergone population changes in the last ten years. Second, people who live there now have moved up and away from areas which they consider much worse, like Harlem, part of Brooklyn, the East Bronx, Puerto Rico and Haiti. Neighborhood, for the rest of this paper, will be artificially defined as the area served by one school under study.

I want to describe for you some studies we have recently done which, I hope, will serve to show the potential richness of the broader approach to political socialization I have delineated. As there are a number of different studies there are a number of different methodologies to review. The primary methodology of the Schwartz (n.d.) and Lopate (n.d.) studies was participant observation with a lot of time spent in the schools themselves (Schwartz 14 months, Lopate 3 months). The Schwartz study was supplemented by interviews with staff and parents and children. Lopate's by interviews with staff and some video tape analysis. Marraccini's study used a more systematic kind of observation methodology (described more fully below) in examining peer effects in playground settings. He severely limited his observation to a particular dimension, following the work of Whiting et. al, 1966 and Whiting and Whiting 1970. My own time organized around a full teaching schedule brings us to a total of about 26 full time equivalent months spent in the variety of field settings examined.

The studies reported here began intermittent field work in the Spring of 1969 and continued until 1971, with the greatest field activity in the Spring and Summer of 1970. The time span covered for any one setting, e.g. a classroom, ranges from 6 to 40 weeks, with three months the more

usual figure. Now three months is not a large amount of time by traditional anthropology fieldwork standards. In a field situation in which physical survival is not a problem, and in which the native language(s) are the same as the anthropologists' three months is often equivalent when focusing on a particular problem to 12 months in more traditional settings. I must also note that while the length of time we have spent studying one field situation is short by anthropological standards, it is long when compared with previous work in education, even in anthropology and education. Observation studies in education are often conditioned by a study of Withall's who showed that the time spent observing a classroom is non-productive after a period of two hours. He argued that you see nothing new in extending your observation time beyond this. Some recent work in anthropology and education has followed this trend (e.g. Leacock 1968). We do not find Withall's findings compelling. All the time spans he studied were too short to discover the dynamics we are after. His work was oriented to the evaluation of teachers; not to the ethnographic descriptions of the dynamics of classroom life. Indeed, such a methodology may be counter productive to such a goal.

We have often noted in our research in a classroom that it is possible to get a quick and clear grasp of what is going on, then for two or three weeks see the 'same thing over and, over,' then in the fourth week on to have the initial patterning or structure prove inadequate as an analytic tool. It is almost as if we get down to another level which does not necessarily invalidate the initial structure hypothesized by without which that structure seems superficial and incomplete. It is not that by staying longer that you discover that schools are really not authoritarian or rigid as others have described

them (Leacock, 1968, Levy 1970, and specifically for politics Adler and Harrington 1970: 189-191) but rather that by staying longer it is possible to observe patterns of student responses to those structures; and then the interplay, or lack of it, between students and the structures provided by the school. Goffman (1961), might have called this 'the underlife of the institution.' Be assured that the underlife is not discovered in one hour of observation, yet it is precisely this which we must discover if we are going to follow Langton's lead and study the informal civic learning in the school.

In addition to the data produced by the methods already outlined we are fortunate to have an anlysis of the textbooks likely to be used in the classrooms in this district. The methodology for that study is summarized when the data are presented below and fully described in Harrington and Adler (1971).

FINDINGS

I shall have little time here to do anything but briefly summarize our findings. Full publication of these and other studies will follow. The findings will be examined within four categories: pupils, peers, pupils and staff, and finally textbooks.

a) Pupils

By pupils we mean the children as they behave in school (distinguishing it from 'peers' or children interacting outside of school). Our concern in this first category is with how children structure their behavior in the school. Schwartz (n.d.) distinguished three kinds of settings within school in which pupils can interact. Within classrooms she distinguished between 'learning time' and 'non-learning time.'

Schwartz found that a good deal of pupil time in classroom was spent reacting against the teachers and the school. Yet she also observed dynamic processes among the students, shifting interactions between groups, tightening and loosening of boundaries in response to school situations and peer generated action patterns. She found "in learning time, alliances are networks of communication or identification aganist the teacher and the children. At lunch, self created rules lay groundworks for group formations which maintain lines of political interests and needs for protections of members. Finally, in classroom (non-formal) the process is less bounded, more around interests and less around alliance and protection."

"In these settings, the activity range is wide and variable. It alters from heirarchies to dyads, from conflicts to conferences and from secrecy to exploration. Each of these elements of behavior has a function in relation to classroom and lunchroom pressures. The informal systems provide the under-current of the formal schooling." (Schwartz n.d.)

The presence or absence of varying degrees of control and pressure in each setting define the lines of alliances and determine group dynamics, according to Schwartz.

b) Peers

Schwartz reports a good deal of aggression in some of her settings and emphasizes the amount of time that pupils spend reacting against school structures. Marraccini (n.d.) examines the forms of social organization that would be manifested by kids in the absence of immediate adult supervision. Focusing on a playground not attached to the school, he follows our definition of politics by focusing on three swings. As the swings fit our definition of a scarce resource (there being more than

three children in the playground most times) he observed how children made decisions about how those swings were allocated. What he found was something quite remarkable:

> "in times of great demands kids act not to maximize possession of a swing but rather to maximize access to a swing.'

Those who have read Schwartz's paper will be suprised at the low frequencies of conflict and aggression in Marraccini's data. He argues that there are rules which are understood by the children which they can activate to get swings without resorting to violence. Indeed, it is in the playground that we have seen the most amount of practice of political skills designed to foster political efficacy. I.e., it is in the peer group that the kids are able to learn and practice political skills. The further finding that Schwartz and Marraccini feel that violence is less common here than in the school led us into a study now beginning which observes the same children in various 'educational' settings including schools, family and peers.

c) Pupils and staff

Lopate focuses on pupil-staff interaction. Discrepancies in the behaviors she observed and what people said they were doing led her to analyze her materials from the perspective provided for ritual events by Gluckman (1962) and Turner (1969), and talk about the separation of myth and reality. She observed a school teetering on the brink of organizational disaster sending parents a letter on how wonderful this school is for their children. She observed assemblies to observe "Spanish-American Heritage Day" whose main behavior for the children was waiting

for the program to begin. Under the myth of "Spanish heritage" kids may learn (in Henry's 1957 terms) to be docile.

Lopate's findings are not unique. Teachers are often observed doing one thing while saying another. I was once taken proudly by a principal to observe a bi-lingual junior high classroom which was part of an experimental program planned in response to community pressures to get instruction in Spanish in a neighborhood which was 50% Spanish speaking. This classroom (one of only four in a school of 3,000 students) was described by the principal as we approached. "It signaled a new age of understanding and communication among peoples." "It provided students with the tools necessary to communicate effectively with their peers, teachers" etc., and "would make it possible for them to learn in Spanish, what they have previously not been able to learn in English." We arrived at the door of the classroom. The teacher emerged. The principal explained our desire to observe. She said, "I'm sorry you can't come in today. I'm not speaking to them. They were so bad yesterday that I am punishing them.' So much for the manifest curriculum.

Equally interesting is the suggestion implicit in some of Lopate's material that the teachers themselves are socialized by the school experience. These materials show a teacher who has learned the passivity (docility) lessons well.

> "although. . .Miss Mera was concerned that her students understood the rules she might be giving them (say in spelling), when it came to directives from outside the classroom she kept herself in a passive position. . . (e.g.) when one day Miss Mera got a directive to take her class to a new room for snacks, she showed much the same passivity: not asking why, and not explaining

> to the students, she simply led them to a new room. Then when the directive appeared to have been a mistake, she waited patiently for new orders while her children waited, somewhat less acquiescently, behind her. (Lopate, n.d.).

Even Lopate's Mr. Schwartz who often threatens rebellion is only moved to open rebellion on one occasion, and that on the trip to the beach safely isolated from the school environment and the principal.

After a lesson on individual rights, what is learned when an entire class of third graders is marched to the girls' and boys' rooms at the same time? As to justice, watch a boy accused by a monitor immediately sanctioned by a teacher with no due process, or watch one boy be punished by a teacher for something several others had done earlier without punishment. Adler and Harrington (1970) argued that children learned potent lessons from this "latent" curriculum. Specifically Adler and Harrington (1970) suggested children learned that punishment was capricious, not judicious; accusation was often equivalent to conviction; and that in the allocation of premiums in the school some are privileged and some are not. Lopate's data illustrate each of these phenomena.

> Miss Mera has been giving a Spanish grammar lesson. The room has reached a state of excitment because of the competition for correct answers. There has been some talking out of turn, mostly humorous, which until now Miss Mera has ignored.
>
> She now says, "I'm going to give a verb. You say whether it's singular or plural." And she adds

that whoever talks out of turn will have to leave the room, "because we have a lot of work to do." Then she asks "el singular de papel;" "el plural de automovil;" and "el plural de calles."

While Miss Mera is asking Aracelis, Elena says something. 'Out,' says Miss Mera, "lo siento.' Elena says, "No! No!" The protest goes back and forth several times between the teacher and Elena, and Elena ends up staying.

Five minutes later Miss Mera is giving more singulars and plurals. Now Aracelis talks out of turn, and Miss Mera says "Get out Aracelis." 'But you let Elena stay!" says Aracelis. Miss Mera responds to this by saying, 'Both!' and tells them it will be for five minutes. Once they are out of the room, she continues with the lesson.

This is an interesting case because when the ideal (equality) was presented the teacher acknowledged its legitimacy but did it in a way in which illustrated the negative side of equality ("Both!") rather than its protective feature.

Lopate described the rituals of waiting in assemblies, waiting for the program to begin, and the ceremonies marking entrance into the school. Not only do kids learn status definitions (who can make whom wait--time=scarce resource), throughout her paper she is arguing that the children are being led to accept symbolic definitions of real life situations over their objective reality. The school is successful, family style, they are happy, they are learning to be bilingual, etc. In terms of the kinds of learning that goes on in such settings, we would predict two types of learning: one a content learning

to cope with relatively authoritarian regimes and to respond with appropriate docility and civility; the other to learn from a positively charged symbolic presenta ion of a reality to legitimate behaviors which otherwise might not be acceptable. These are lessons useful to society. The practical experience he gains in school prepares the student for certain kinds of relationships and political realities; while the practice he gets in acquiring scarce resources in his peer group may complement that learning and prepares him for other social relationships. Further we feel that the reality of the child's life in the ghetto and the skills he needs to function there are so totally separated from the view of the world provided him by the symbolic representations of the school about life that the latter do not relate well to the reality of his existence. We now examine this further.

d) Textbooks

We argued above that the symbolic representation of reality becomes more and more remote from the actual political behaviors of the child, until they take on a purely formal, ritualized air in comparison to his actual life style. This is clearly seen in the study of textbooks. In a study that drew on school districts from the entire state of New York, Norman Adler and I did a content analysis of the political socialization implications of grade school textbooks. One of our sample districts encompassed the materials used in the schools in the studies reported here.[2]

A content analysis (see Holsti 1969) of these materials was carried out in order to gauge what children were being told about government compared with the rest of what they learned about politics. We limited our coding to materials relating to American government. Covernment was broken

[2]Note that our analysis would not include the special summer textbooks used in Lopate's study.

down into three components authority, regime, and community following Easton's systems theory which provides a oft used means for viewing the inter-relationship of diverse threads in the fabric of political life. An authority, according to Easton, is a member of the system in whom the primary responsibility is lodged for taking care of the daily routines of a political system. Elected representatives, other public officials such as civil servants, qualify in our system. Regime refers to the underlying goals that the members of the system pursue, the norms or rules of the game through which they conduct their political business, and the formal and informal structures or authority that arrange who is to do what in the system. It is clear from Marraccini's work that the national regime and the regime of the playground are distinct. Easton defines community (he calls it political Community) as that aspect of a political system we can identify as a collection of persons who desire a division of political labor. Harrington and Adler (1971) found that every eighth grade class is not receiving books with a similar meaning. Litt's accusation that there is class bias in the preparation of children for a place in the democratic system seems to hold up, if not everywhere, at least, frequently. The working class districts look more like the typical second grade than middle class districts do; the middle class districts look more like the typical eighth grade than working class districts. Images of political leaders as malevolent are seldom found in second grade books, but they are seldom found in any working class texts, either. Second grade texts rarely see the political system as not accountable; but working class texts do not, either. In the area of participant orientation, the working class districts encourage participation orientation, while middle class districts do not do so as often.

Yet how real is this participation? They felt it was merely a symbolic and idealized notion of "the good citizen." In nearly every respect, the textbook materials of the state seem to aim at depriving the lower social class child of the benefits of perspectives that will make him a realistic observer and participant in the political system, while more often making those materials available in middle class districts.

Turning to the text materials likely to be used in our school; focusing on the image presented in the text materials about political authorities we found that the fourth and sixth grade children in our working class multi-ethnic ghetto are told that authorities are never malevolent (65% benevolent, 35% neutral); always approachable (95% approachable, 5% neutral, 0% distant); and almost always accountable (77% accountable, 15% neutral, 8% not accountable). In addition, fourth and sixth grade children in our school are told that we live in are told that we live in a pluralistic society where politics are consensual (65%) not conflict oriented (24%). He is told that the stress must be placed upon majority rule not minority rights. In fact, our school (which is itself 90% minority) gets less material than any other district in the state dealing with the rights of minorities in american democracy.

Clearly this content serves to combine the two lessons outlined above: i.e., be docile and believe in the symbolic idealized picture of politics. It is not likely to train the child to the nitty gritty of political life. It will come as no surprise to those who see schools as primarily concerned with maintaining the status quo, i.e., as conservative institutions, that children are being excluded from knowledge which could help him more successfully compete for premiums in the political process. Given the place of these students though in the quest for premiums in the larger society, how does the never never land described

by the school cognitively survive comparisons by the child with the totality of his existence? Our work is progressing on the point, I offer the following discussion.

DISCUSSION

1. Behavior practice

Levy (1970) has argued that the ghetto school teaches skills (i.e., waiting) that are in fact those most used in lower class life (e.g., welfare lines). I think our analysis can go a little further. I have argued elsewhere that the undemocratic features of schools may be important for a society to maintain itself; if the society ever anticipates a need to resort to undemocratic acts to control citizens it would be important to build a sense of legitimacy for such measures into its people. Consider the 1968 Democratic convention, the violence in the street, the police brutality, and the frequent comment that a "police state" existed, both on the convention floor and in downtown Chicago. Assuming that police-state methods were used in Chicago, how is it that 71 percent of the American people approved of these tactics, as measured by a poll following the disorders? For a more recent event consider the mass arrests in Washington in the spring of 1971. It is important to understand that these are not isolates. The political science literature has consistently found a remarkably high number of people in this country who don't understand the Bill of Rights, don't approve of individual items in the Bill of Rights, or don't understand or approve of the basic civil liberties that the Bill of Rights seeks to guarantee (see, for example, Remmers 1963). There seems to be in our society an underlying penchant, if you will, for authoritarian regimes,

or at least a tolerance of them. That a large percentage of our population seems to feel a need for authoritarian methods at certain times seems beyond question.

It is clear that support for authoritarianism has certain functions for the society. Support for such a regime is probably adaptive in what Wallace (1961) would call a conservative society threatened by a revolutionary or revitalization movement, in the examples given, the "New Left." Reactionary measures to control such a movement are a natural response of a conservative society. Therefore, it is to be expected that a conservative society will build into its citizens a certain tolerance for reactionary or authoritarian responses to social crises in case they are needed.

The acceptance of authoritarianism must come from somewhere. Studies of classroom behavior offer one explanation. Adler and Harrington (1970) offered the hypothesis that this undemocratic pattern of our schools is not a random or haphazard phenomenon but is in reality functional; that is, it is important for a conservative state to train its citizens to accept authoritarian regimes in case they are needed to maintain order. Since the schools are fulfilling that function, they are supported; and society resists attempts to change schools or to give students power. We must start thinking not only about how undemocratic the schools are, but also about some of the functions that the organization of the school might have in the larger society.

2. Symbols and ritual

We turn now to where there is a conflict: between the symbols, ideals and myths of the school and the political reality of the child's life.

Burdieu and Passeron (1970) argue that curriculum is symbolic violence, a device by which the literate class perpetuates itself in power. Our anthropological research has reinforced for us that the school is an important source of political learning, but in a different sense from Hess and Torney's original finding. They argued on the basis of content learning. We have focused, using anthropological methods rather than questionnaires, on what political skills, beliefs and values the child learns in a school setting which will enable him to compete politically in the larger society. Our findings, tentative as they are, suggest that schools may be accomplishing much more than even Hess and Torney suggested.

Edelman (1964) argues that much of politics is symbolic: the art of ruling is the art of calling upon the right symbols and ritual observances to legitimize a range of activities (for example, the Department of Defense, Vietnamization). Schools may, therefore, be effectively training children to respond to symbolic ritual in granting legitimacy and to pay less attention to actual behavior. The New Yorker recently argued that

> "The President's trip to China shows that television coverage opens up what is virtually a new field of action to men in power. With television, a President can draw eyes away from the piecemeal, day to day unfolding of policy and focus them on complex, powerful, <u>symbolic</u> events that he can manipulate more easily than he can the work itself. It allows him to act directly on the country's imagination,

like a high priest." (New Yorker, Notes and Comment, 3/25/72:29). (emphasis added)

What is new is not the use of symbols and ritual by those in power, simply the use of television to facilitate it.

At one level, the differences between the manifest and latent occurrences in school would seem to be a powerful impetus for changing the curriculum so that these differences would disappear yet they are masked by legitimizing symbols. But if Edelman is right and I think he is, these differences actually appear in the larger society as well. Therefore schools may actually be doing a very good job of training children to respond to symbolic ritual legitimizing cues in granting legitimacy and to pay less attention to actual behaviors. We need to find out.

But how is it that schools can get away with only these aspects of political learning in a democracy and not teach about political process, or skills leading to effective political action? Two answers suggest themselves.

1) Undoubtedly a large part of the problem derives from a curriculum that centers its attention on turning out "good citizens" while defining "good citizens" as those who are obedient to established legal authority, who conform to the rules and laws of the community without questioning the derivation of those laws or their purpose, and those who do not "make trouble." Indeed, Hess and Torney found that "teachers of young children place particular stress upon compliance, de-emphasizing all other political topics . . . Concern with compliance is characteristic of teachers of all grades (up to the eighth grade). This is reflected in children's perceptions of democracy. A study of sixth graders found

that to children, democracy means such things as "helping the class," "being kind and friendly," "not fighting or cheating," "obeying teachers and school laws," and "trying to be quiet."

This resembles a Platonic notion of politics that views the good society as one filled with harmony and views as evil the factionalism, competition, and shifting power base of politics as we know it. Everyone is familiar with the notion of politics as a "dirty business." Indeed, in study after study, groups throughout society rank the practitioners of politics at the lower end of respected and desirable occupations. They do this while ranking those who profit from the fruits of politics (i.e., Supreme Court justices, U.S. senators, and policemen) at the top of the scale. Plato chose to treat the search for competitive advantage in the distribution of the fruits of power (material goods, deference, safety) among the various groups in society as "symptoms of an unhealthy society." His science of politics contained in it what Wolin has referred to as a major paradox: it was sworn to an eternal hostility to the very subject it pretended to study.

So it is with political education in the schools today. In the search for a foundation that would support the multiple contradictions present in society a dangerous political art is fostered: "the art of ruling becomes the art of imposition." Political education stresses those things in society that produce rules of behavior such as "The Law," or some authority to be venerated such as "The President." Most curriculum is concerned with the promulgation of abstract notions of governance in combination with a sense of respect on the part of students for authorities. The teachers responsible for civics education in school maintain the

attitude that the most important goals of such training are the development of knowledge of government inst tutions and the cultivating of favorable attitudes toward democratic institutions and processes. Far less emphasis is placed on teaching skills for democratic participation.

2) Peer group learning itself may also make the school structure possible. Paul Bohannan, writing about Tiv politics calls our attention to "extra processual events" which work for flexibility in an excessively rigid structure.

> The "revolt" or counteracting aspect of the event structure is brought into play to regain elasticity. (Bohannan 1958:11)

Bohannan calls these counter actions "extra processual" because while they are outside the formal structure they help maintain it. Recently, Graham Watson (1970) has presented data concerning schools in South Africa which can be used to illustrate this framework. There the rigid system of apartheid symbolically classified people as white, colored or black which classification (done at entrance to school) determines the life style from that point on. The system is absolutely rigid; it is made more viable by extra-processual events. That is, in reality, some movement is possible from one group to the other. Watson describes a white school in a neighborhood changing its racial balance to colored. In order to protect the school budget the principal accepts as white large numbers of children he 'knows' to be colored. As the official classification is the only important thing, he effectively makes coloreds into whites for budget reasons. This extra processual process has the effect of making it possible for upwardly mobile coloreds to move (by generations) into the economically privileged class, helping to perpetuate the formally rigid system.

Perhaps our peer generated learning provides what the school will not formally provide, and thereby helps perpetuate that structure by providing the opportunity to learn political skills essential to operating in the larger society as well as those necessary to "make out" in the formal rigidity of the school itself! This however means that it is important that we study peer groupings from various social classes and ethnic groups in order to describe the kinds of structures they provide for learning, and second, that we just spend more time studying how such learning can be used in school settings. For example, we are now embarking on a study which will replace swings as a scarce resource with 'teacher time' in certain open classroom situations. Will the findings parallel those of Marraccini for playgrounds, or will setting influence not only the behaviors but the rules by which the behaviors are generated (regime).

One of the limitations of the participant observation methodologies used here is that while it is useful in delineating structures and process, it is not as useful in demonstrating that what seems to be learned in a classroom actually is. For this we need other kinds of data and it is at this point that the interaction of the fields of psychology and anthropology can be most useful. That is, armed with anthropological descriptions of setting, use psychological measures of outcomes to test learning assumptions. For example, take a recent luncheon debate between a political scientist and myself. We were focusing on the disparity I have described above between the reality of the ghetto child's life and the idealized picture of politics offered to him. The political scientist argued this was a good thing, giving the child incentive to change the

system and make it more nearly approximate the ideal. I argued the danger of alienating the child from what he could perceive was a sham, and besides the ghetto child was getting no training in school which would increase his efficacy even if he wanted to act. Obviously, an empirical study could be done to ascertain how children in fact responded to the apparent conflict perceived by the researcher. I suspect the political scientist's position is useful only for small groups of 'elites' and that the second is a much more widely found phenomena.

We need to move toward a day in which anthropological methodologies and psychological techniques will not be thought of as alternatives but as equally useful at different points in the study of socialization. This is also a good place to emphasize that the studies reported here have not been through that full process: that we are dealing with working papers and research in progress. These studies do not pretend to be final answers: they are published instead to raise questions; questions we feel are important but for too long have not been asked. As research continues, and others begin to replicate our findings, we hope to be better able to describe how education for political behavior occurs. We argued four omissions in the present literature. This paper has not adequately filled any one of them, but is has begun to suggest ways to do so.

One final point. Our focus has been rather narrowly on political socialization. In doing so we have trampled over many issues discussed by educators. I have not chosen to take up those debates here, but we are aware of the existence of debate in the field of education as to how schools, classrooms, teaching, should be structured and that the variables

we are discussing are relevant to that debate. Our purpose, here, and in the field of anthropology and education in general, is to cautiously provide an ever deepening empirical and theoretical base so that policy can more reasonably be made on the basis of empirical research and not polemic. And, when we do get to being involved with policy it will be as good applied anthropology has often demonstrated, in limited projects of limited goals. The remaking of american education is not going to be accomplished overnight; anthropologists, of all researchers, should be acutely aware of that, and avoid the lure for sensationalism that belongs to the journalist, and continue without prejudging the answers to try to unravel the problem which is american education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, Norman and Charles Harrington

1970 The learning of political behavior. Chicago, Scott-Foresman.

Burdieu, P. and J.C. Passeron

1970 La Reproduction. Paris, Edition Minuit.

Comitas, Lambros

1971 Reflections in curriculum and education in the British Caribbean. Mimeo. Paper presented to the Colloquium in Philosophy and the Social Sciences, Teachers College-Columbia University.

Easton, David and Jack Dennis

1969 Children in the political system. New York, McGraw Hill.

1967 The child's acquisition of regime norms: political efficacy. American Political Science Review 61:25-38.

Easton, David

1965 A systems analysis of political life. New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Edelman, Murray

1967 The symbolic uses of politics. Urbana, Univ. of Illinois Press.

Engstrom, Richard L.

1970 Race and compliance: differential political socialization. Polity 3:100-111.

Gluckman, Max

1962 Custom and conflict. Oxford.

Greenberg, Edward

1970 Children and government: a comparison across racial lines. Midwest Journal of Political Science XIV: 249-275.

1971 Consensus and dissent: trends in political socialization research. In E. Greenberg, ed., Political socialization, 1970.

Goffman, Erving

1961 Asylums. New York, Doubleday.

Gurr, Ted Robert

1970 Why men rebel. Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Hannerz, Ulf

1969 Soulside. New York, Columbia University Press.

Harrington, Charles and Norman Adler

1971 Political socialization implications of grade school social studies textbooks in New York State. New York State commission on the quality, cost, and financing of elementary and secondary education in New York State. Mimeo.

Harrington, Charles

n.d. Political socialization. New York, Free Press. (forthcoming)

Harrington, Charles and John Whiting

1972 Socialization process and personality. In F.L.K. Hsu, ed., Psychological anthropology. Cambridge, Schenkman Publications.

Hartup, W.W.

1969 Peer interaction and social organization. In D.A. Goslin, ed., Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago, Rand McNally.

Henry, Jules

1957 Attitude organization in elementary school classrooms. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 27:117-133.

1963 Culture against man. New York, Random House.

Hess, Robert D. and David Easton

1960 The child's changing image of the president. Public Opinion Quarterly 24:632-644.

Hess, Robert D. and Judith Torney

1967 The development of political attitudes in children. Chicago, Aldine.

Holsti, Ole R.

1969 Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities. Reading, Mass., Addison-Wesley.

Jaros, Dean, Herbert Hirsch and Frederick Fleron

1968 The malevolent leader: political socialization in an american sub-culture. American Political Science Review 62:564-575.

Jennings, M. Kent and R.G. Niemi

1968 Patterns of political learning. Harvard Educational Review 38:443-467.

Kohlberg, Lawrence

1969 Stage and sequence: the cognitive developmental approach to socialization. In D.A. Goslin, ed., Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago, Rand McNally.

Langton, Kenneth

1967 Peer group and school and the political socialization process. American Political Science Review 61:751-758.

Lawson, Edwin D.

1963 Development of patriotism in children. Journal of Psychology 55:279-286.

Leacock, Eleanor

1968 Teaching and learning in city schools. New York, Basic Books.

LeVine, Robert

1960 The internalization of political values in stateless societies. Human Organization 19:51-58.

1963 Political socialization and culture change. In C. Geertz, ed., Old societies and new states. New York, Free Press.

Levy, Gerald

1970 Ghetto school. New York, Pegasus.

Liebow, Eliot

1965 Tally's corner. Boston, Little Brown.

Litt, Edgar

1963 Civic education, community norms, and political indoctrination. American Sociological Review 28:69-75.

Lopate, Carol

n.d. Structure, hierarchy and political learning. Manuscript. To be published in a volume of occasional papers by Teachers College Press.

Lyons, Schley

1970 The political socialization of ghetto children: efficacy and cynicism. Journal of Politics 32:288-305.

Marraccini, Ernest

n.d. Swinging in New York. Manuscript. To be published in a volume of occasional papers by Teachers College Press.

Mayer, Philip and Iona

1970 Socialization by peers: the youth organization of the Red Xhosa. In P. Mayer, ed., Socialization: the approach from social anthropology. London, Tavistock.

Miller, Walter A.

1958 Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency. In M. Wolfgang, L. Savitz, and N. Johnson, eds., The sociology of crime and delinquency. New York, Wiley.

1964 The corner gang boys get married. Transaction 1:10-12.

Parsons, Talcott

1949 Essays in sociological theory, pure and applied. Glencoe, Free Press.

Pettit, George A.

1946 Primitive education in North America. University of California Publications. American Archaeology and Ethnology 43:1-182.

Schwartz, Frances

n.d. Peer group interaction: patterns and dynamics in one city school. Manuscript. To be published in a volume of occasional papers by Teachers College Press.

Sigel, Roberta

1965 An exploration into some aspects of political socialization: school children's reactions to the death of a president. In M. Wolenstein and G. Liman, eds., Children and the death of a president. New York, Doubleday.

1970 Learning about politics. New York, Random House.

Turner, Victor

1969 The ritual process. Chicago, Aldine.

Wallace, Anthony F.C.

1971 Culture and personality (second edition). New York, Random House.

Whyte, William F.

1955 Street corner society. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, Richard W.

1970 Learning to be Chinese: the political socialization of children in Taiwan. Cambridge, MIT Press.